

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application, and were rejected in the Office Action dated November 12, 2003. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed. Claim 8 has been amended. No new matter is added by these amendments.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 112 Objection to Claims**

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for reciting “only a single step.” Although Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, amended Claim 8 recites more than a single step. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection no longer applies to claims 8-11.

**II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections of Claims**

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Hetherington et al.*, (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,810). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, for example, recites in a computer system, a method for providing for concurrent subprocessing of a master process, the method comprising the steps of interfacing with a master process when a user-specific operation is encountered, and mapping a user-specific process so that it overlays virtual addresses of the master process. The method further recites processing the user-specific operation in the user-specific process.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner states “this is the method of claim 8 and 9 above” (Office Action, p. 4). With respect to claim 8, the Examiner states that “Hetherington does not explicitly teach user-specific process is mapped to virtual addresses that are equivalent to virtual address of the global process.” (Office Action, p. 3). Additionally, the Examiner states “it

would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to recognize that virtual addresses are needed when a process spawning a child process (the endpoint executables are spawned by daemon 24a, col. 5 lines 2-10).” (Office Action, p.3). Further, in discussing claim 1, the Examiner states “claim 8 also meets overlays (inherent when spawning, the child process will overlay the virtual address of the parent).” (Office Action, p. 4).

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner states “one of ordinary skilled in the art would recognize that once the process is spawned, the child process would inherent its parent address space.” (Office Action, p. 5). The Examiner also states “the combination of Hetherington and the knowledge of well-known regarding spawning process would meet each user-specific process is mapped to virtual addresses that are equivalent to virtual addresses of the global process.” (Office Action, p. 5).

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection to claim 1. In particular, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s assertions of “well known” processes, including the assertions of “the knowledge of well-known regarding spawning process,” (Office Action, p. 5) “virtual addresses are needed when a process spawning a process,” (Office Action, p. 3) “the child process would inherent its parent address space,” (Office Action, p. 5) and “inherent when spawning, the child process will overlay the virtual address of the parent.” (Office Action, p. 5). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s assertions and submit that these assertions are not requirements, necessary, inherent nor accurate, and Applicants’ respectfully request that the Examiner cite references pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2) and M.P.E.P. 2144.03 if the rejections to the claims are to be maintained in combination with these aspects. Per the Examiner’s admission in the Office Action, there is no cited reference disclosing “user-specific process is mapped to virtual addresses that are equivalent to virtual address of the global

process,” and similarly “mapping a user-specific process so that it overlays virtual addresses of the master process” with respect to claim 1.

Applicants also respectfully traverse the rejection to claim 1 at least because the Examiner states “it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to recognize that virtual addresses are needed when a process spawning a child process (the endpoint executables are spawned by daemon 24a, col. 5 lines 2-10).” (Office Action, p. 3). Although the Examiner implies here that the daemon 24a is the process and the endpoint executables are the child processes and that virtual addresses are needed, *Hetherington et al.* states “[o]nce the executable is spawned, the daemon 24a has no further interaction with it” (col. 5, ll. 6-7; emphasis added) which Applicants submit teaches away from “mapping a user-specific process so that it overlays virtual addresses of the master process,” and does not teach or suggest virtual addresses.

As a result, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Claims 2-7 depend on claim 1 and are therefore patentable at least for the same reasons. Claims 8, 12 and 15 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Furthermore, claims 9-11, 13-14, and 16-21 depend on claims 8, 12 and 15 respectively and are therefore patentable at least for the same reasons.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing comments, Applicants respectfully submit that the present amendment places the above-referenced application in condition for allowance, and thus, a swift allowance is respectfully requested so that the application may swiftly pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 10, 2004



Kimani P. Clark  
Registration No. 45,969

Customer No. 26263  
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
Telephone: 202/408-2914  
Facsimile: 312/876-7934